WORD LIST 1 2 For the People: Ms. Flores 3 Sergeant Rhoades The Witness: The Court: 5 For the Defendant: Ms. Chaplin 6 7 8 Sergeant Craig 9 10 Walter Clark 11 Mr. Guzman 12 Officer Martinez Miranda 13 Sergeant Rhoades 14 15 **BEGIN TRANSCRIPTION WITH:** 16 17 By Ms. Chaplin: Q. You do not believe it causes fear? 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

WARM UP

Is there an objection to the pending question? THE COURT:

Yes, I do have an objection. MS. FLORES:

THE COURT: All right. Well, then state your grounds for the record,

Objection. That's vague as phrased. MS. FLORES:

MS. CHAPLIN: I will withdraw it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Have you received any kind of training or BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. education as to using / the language that Sergeant Craig used when he spoke to Mr. Guzman regarding the waiver?

MS. FLORES: Objection. That's been asked and answered.

I thought it was / withdrawn. MS. CHAPLIN:

It was asked in a different way. MS. FLORES:

Do you understand the question, Investigator? THE COURT:

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.

It is a bit vague. I know where / you are going, THE COURT:

Ms. Chaplin. I am not quite sure the witness does, although that's not the stated grounds.

Sustained. Let's try again.

Thank you. / MS. FLORES:

The particular phrase that was used in this Q. BY MS. CHAPLIN: case, the question "Do you have a problem talking to us," have you or your partner ever / received any training regarding the use of that phrase in questioning a suspect?

- No, ma'am. Α.
- And you didn't know ahead of time that's the terminology / that your Q.

| 1 | A. | Yes, I think. |
|---------------------------------|----------|---|
| 2 | Q. | Then, someone else came / in. I think Officer Martinez came in; |
| 3 | correct? | |
| 4 | A. | I believe so, yes, ma'am. |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | STOP |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 2526 | | |
| 27 | | • |
| 28 | | |
| ا ت | | |

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

2627

28

THE COURT: Defendant and counsel are present. Let's continue with your examination at this time.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. During the time that you were present, there were many instances in / which either yourself or your partner interrupted Mr. Guzman and told him not to talk.

- A. I don't recall that.
- Q. You told him to just listen; / true?
- A. That could be possible.
- Q. There were, in fact, a number of times where Sergeant Craig raised his voice in order to speak over Mr. / Guzman's voice; correct?
 - A. That is possible.
- Q. And, isn't it true that you have been trained to do that, to use that technique in order to / maintain control of the interview?

MS. FLORES: Objection. Vague as phrased.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Not to my recollection. No training on that specific issue.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. Isn't it / true that you have been trained to cut off the suspect's denials to allow you to continue to talk to him about the -- well, I / am sorry.

Isn't it true that you have been trained to cut off the denials of the person being questioned?

- A. I believe I have read / some bulletins about that as a technique.
- Q. Okay. What is that process designed to do? In other words, what's the purpose of that technique as / far as your training?
 - A. To try to get at the truth.
 - Q. Well, you say that you were trained?

- A. Correct.
- Q. You have received some training or / you have read materials about cutting off the suspect when he begins to deny the charges; right?
- A. I believe I have seen some articles or / read some information about that as a technique.
- Q. Okay. That process, as far as what you have read, that is for the purpose of ensuring / that the suspect doesn't stop the conversation by asking for an attorney or wanting to stop talking; right?

MS. FLORES: Objection. That's vague as phrased.

THE COURT: Overruled. You / may answer if you understand the question.

THE WITNESS: I could not say that as an absolute, no.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. Okay. You are aware that it has that consequence; / correct?

MS. FLORES: Objection. Lacks foundation and speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. Well, isn't it also true that when you are talking to the person being detained, you are trained / to take the position that the question of guilt is not at issue.

- A. No, that's not correct.
- Q. You tell them you are there to find / out why something happened?
- A. Yes, it is to try to obtain the complete truth. That's part of an interview is to try to find out / what happened.
- Q. Well, isn't it accurate to say that your partner kept telling Mr. Guzman you had verified he was guilty and all you wanted / to determine was why it happened?
- A. That's partially correct. Why something happens is an extremely important aspect of the interview.

- Q. In fact, it was repeated / to my client that the topic of whether or not he actually did the crime was not at issue; right?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. If you / are looking to find out the truth, why are you trained to keep insisting that the issue of whether or not someone did the crime / is no longer at issue?

MS. FLORES: Objection. That's argumentative.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question, please?

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. Sure.

If you say that your intent / is to obtain the complete truth, why are you then trained to insist that the issue of whether or not he committed the offense is / not in question?

- A. Again, as a method to try to get at the truth.
- Q. Okay. Well, isn't it accurate that it is actually a way / to cause fear in the suspect and to make him feel hopeless?
 - A. Absolutely not.

BEGIN TYPING

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. You do not believe it causes fear?

- A. No, ma'am, I don't. /
- Q. In your experience, when two officers confront a suspect who has been arrested and they are telling him they know he did it, don't you / believe that has the effect of making the suspect feel like it's hopeless?
 - A. No, I personally don't believe that happens.

MS. FLORES: Object. Lack of foundation. It / calls for speculation, and it is irrelevant as to what this witness believes.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I do not.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. And yet, you / don't know why you have been trained to use that method; is that correct?

MS. FLORES: I am going to object. That's been asked and answered as / to why the officer was trained.

THE COURT: Very well. Sustained.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. You were also present when Sergeant Craig spoke at length to Mr. Guzman regarding his own / life and how he, Sergeant Craig, said he could try to understand what my client was going through?

- A. I believe so, yes, indeed.
- Q. Well, that's / an approach that you have been trained to use; isn't that right?
- A. I can't say any specific training has instructed me to use that method / other than my personal experience. I have observed that some fellow officers do that.
- Q. Well, I reviewed the transcript, and I noticed that you did / not use it. Actually, your partner was conducting the interrogation there; is that correct?

- A. It is almost impossible to answer the question unless I know / exactly where in the transcript you are talking about.
- Q. All right. Well, isn't it true that you have been trained to use the techniques that / we have discussed in order to get someone who is reluctant to speak to confess to all the crimes?
- A. Well, the goal in the interview / is always to try to get at the truth and have the defendant talk to provide us with information as to his knowledge of the / events being investigated.
- Q. And you use these techniques as a method or a way to get the suspects who don't want to talk to confess / to you; right?
 - A. Yes, we encourage communication with the suspect.
 - Q. That process has been used before; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. The reason your department uses that is / you have found in the past that it has worked in getting reluctant suspects to speak to you; right?

MS. FLORES: I object. That's compound. I feel / it lacks foundation.

THE COURT: All right. Sustained.

BY MS. CHAPLIN: Q. Have you ever personally used the approach of telling a suspect that you have your own life history similar / to what you believe they were going through that enables you to understand why they did something that you believe they did?

- A. Over the course / of many years, I am positive that there have been cases where I may have utilized that method.
- Q. Okay. Apparently, the reason you did that / is because you thought that approach would help you personally connect with the suspect being interviewed; correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. That approach would help the person being / questioned feel closer

to you, feel like you were his friend, and he would open up and talk; right?

To be more willing to testify. / Not testify, but be more willing to

1

2

Were you present in the interview room when Sergeant Craig brought

But, you were present when he told the defendant several times that

he would be spending the rest of his life / in prison?

up the topic of Mr. Guzman / having to go to protective custody?

I don't recall any conversations about that.

I don't think he said that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

And then, after that, that's when the conversation with the defendant

Yes, / ma'am.

Α.

Q.

1

2

Now, you testified / on cross-examination, and I believe you said you

responded to the scene where the defendant was under arrest; is that correct?

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

1

2

3

4

5

Yes.

That was about how long?

Approximately six minutes.

| 1 | Q. D | id you speak with Mr. Clark? | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | A. Y | es, ma'am. | |
| 3 | Q. D | id he tell you where he got the cell phone? | |
| 4 | N | /ell, let me rephrase the question. / After this discussion with | |
| 5 | Mr. Clark, did | you start to focus your investigation on the defendant? | |
| 6 | A. Y | es, there was some focus on the defendant. | |
| 7 | Q. D | id / you ever show a photograph of the defendant to Mr. Clark? | |
| 8 | A. T | hat was the other detective in that room. | |
| 9 | MS. CH | APLIN: Objection. Motion to strike. No foundation. / | |
| 10 | THE CO | OURT: Sustained. It is stricken. | |
| 11 | BY MS. | FLORES: Q. Were you in the room with the defendant | |
| 12 | pardon me, with Mr. Clark when a picture of the defendant was shown / to | | |
| 13 | Mr. Clark? | | |
| 14 | A. Y | es. | |
| 15 | Q. A | nd you saw the picture being shown to Mr. Clark? | |
| 16 | A. Y | es, ma'am. I believe I was present. | |
| 17 | Q. N | ow, the person that / was in the picture, is that person here in court | |
| 18 | today? | | |
| 19 | MS. CH | IAPLIN: I object. There is no personal knowledge. | |
| 20 | THE CO | OURT: Sustained. No foundation. | |
| 21 | BY MS. | FLORES: Q. You saw the picture / that was shown to | |
| 22 | Mr. Clark? | | |
| 23 | A. Y | es, ma'am. | |
| 24 | Q. Y | ou took a look at it? | |
| 25 | A. Y | es, ma'am. | |
| 26 | | nd the person who's in court today, do you / see that person that | |
| 27 | was depicted in that photograph on that date? | | |
| 28 | A. Y | es, ma'am. | |

- A. Definitely not.
- Q. Do you recall how your partner was dressed?
- A. I believe he / was dressed more casual.
- Q. Maybe jeans and a shirt, something like that?
- A. More casual than a suit.
- Q. He made no threats that you could hear / directed to the defendant?
- A. No.

MS. FLORES: Your Honor, I have nothing further at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a recess for about ten minutes, then.